

REMARKS

Summary

This Amendment is responsive to the final Office Action mailed on January 29, 2004. Claims 1, 2, 14, 27, 34, 46, 47, 59, 72, and 79 are amended herein. Claims 1-96 are pending.

Claims 1-4, 6, 12-34, 39-49, 51, 57-79, and 84-96 stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Motegi (US 6,307,640), Savitzky (US 6,012,083) and Ikeda (JP 2000155733).

Claims 5, 35-38, 50 and 80-83 stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Motegi, Savitzky, Ikeda, and Newton (US 6,334,142).

Claims 7-11 and 52-56 stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Motegi, Savitzky, Ikeda, and Pearson (US 6,023,684).

Applicants respectfully traverse the foregoing rejections in view of the amended claims and the following comments.

Discussion of Amended Claims

Claims 1, 2, 14, 27, 34, 46, 47, 59, 72, and 79 are amended to clarify that the print job is a print job for printing a document.

Claims 1 and 46 are also amended to clarify that the polling request is a request for any initiated documents and is a separate request sent to the spooling server. In other words, the polling request is not part of the instruction to initiate a print job.

Discussion of Rejection in View of Motegi, Savitzky, and Ikeda

Claims 1-4, 6, 12-34, 39-49, 51, 57-79, and 84-96 stand

rejected as being unpatentable over the combination of Motegi, Savitzky, and Ikeda.

The Motegi reference was discussed in detail in Applicants' Amendment dated October 3, 2003 and in a telephone interview with the Examiner as set forth in Applicants' Response to Interview Summary dated October 13, 2003, both of which are incorporated herein and made a part hereof by reference.

The Savitzky reference was discussed in detail in Applicants' Amendment dated April 30, 2003 and Applicants' Response dated November 11, 2002, both of which are incorporated herein and made a part hereof by reference.

The Examiner has acknowledged that Motegi "does not explicitly teach a computer request for a document file from the spooling server (i.e., the host computer)" (Office Action, page 3). The Examiner relies on Savitzky as teaching "a computer (i.e., client A) in the network requests for a document file from the spooling server (i.e., the agency 32 in fig. 3) and receives the requested document from the agency" (Office Action, page 3).

The Examiner's interpretation of Savitzky is incorrect. First, the client A of Savitzky does not on its own request a web page from the server as is apparently assumed by the Examiner. Only in response to a user input at the client A is a request for a web page sent on to the server via agency 32 (Col. 5, lines 1-3).

Secondly, the agency 32 of Figure 3 of Savitzky is not equivalent to a spooling server for receiving and storing documents. Rather, the agency 32 of Savitzky merely processes a request for a web page from client A and sends the request on to server A on line 38. Server A returns the requested web page to agency 32 on line 40, and the web page is then provided to client A. A Hotlist agent 42 at the agency 32 stores a reference to the web page, but does not store the web page itself (Col. 10, lines 19-67). Therefore, the agency 32 does not store or spool

documents as does the spooling server claimed by Applicants. In contrast, the agency 32 of Savitzky merely acts as an intermediary between a web server and the client A. The web server of Savitzky, which is isolated from the client A by agency 32, stores the web pages.

In addition, Applicants' claims are amended herein to specify that the print job is a print job for printing a document. Savitzky is directed at printing web pages rendered in HTML format on a browser. The system of Savitzky is not applicable to printing a document, as claimed by Applicants. Those skilled in the art will appreciate the technological differences between the requirements for printing of a document from a server over a network and the requirements for printing of a web page from a server.

Further, Applicants' submit that the Examiner's combination of Savitzky (rendering of web pages) and Motegi (network printing) would not result in Applicants' claimed invention as proposed by the Examiner. As discussed in Applicants' previous Amendments and Responses as indicated above, Motegi is directed towards the printing of documents over a network based printing system as a result of user interaction at the printer. In contrast, Savitzky is directed at the use of a web agency disposed between a client and a web server for rendering of a web page (i.e. a Hypertext Markup Language (HTML) document) as requested from a web server by a user at a browser running on a client computer. Savitzky does not teach the transfer of print jobs for a document over a network.

Further, there is no motivation in either Motegi or Savitzky to combine them as suggested by the Examiner. Savitzky is directed at the use of an agency disposed between a web client and a web server for rendering of web pages on a client browser in HTML. The art of dealing with HTML web pages as disclosed in Savitzky is quite distinct from the art of network printing of

documents as described in Motegi.

The Examiner has also acknowledged that neither Motegi nor Savitzky teach a "polling request being automatically forwarded from the printer polling device to the spooling server" (Office Action, page 4). The Examiner relies on Ikeda for teaching a polling request being automatically forwarded to the spooling server.

An English language translation of the Ikeda reference is attached for the Examiner's convenience. In Ikeda, an automatic document acquiring device 14 acquires documents from a server, such as a web server 4, a document server 5, a database server 6, a workgroup server 7, or a BBS server 8, via a network 3 and prints the documents on output device 2. The document acquiring device 14 can be configured to retrieve a document using three separate triggers. The triggers include sending a request for a document at a periodic time interval, an email trigger, and user instructions requesting a document entered at document acquiring device 14 (See English language translation of Ikeda, page 15, para. 0036).

The document acquiring device 14 of Ikeda includes a database access part 143. The database access part 143 accesses document database 12 and obtains data relating to the documents to be acquired. Data extraction part 142 extracts necessary document data obtained by database access part 143 and provides this data to trigger start detector 141. The trigger start detector 141 includes this document data in the request for the document that is sent to the network interface 31 (English language translation of Ikeda, page 12, para. 0030-0031).

The document acquiring device 14 of Ikeda must first contact the database 12 and obtain information regarding a document before formulating a request for that particular document using the obtained information. In Ikeda, the request from the document acquiring device for printing of the document is also the

instruction that initiates the printing of the document. In other words, in Ikeda, the initiating of the document for printing and the polling request for the document are part of the same communication to the server. Further, the document acquiring device is not "polling" the server to check to see if there is any document available to print, since in Ikeda the document acquiring device is already aware of the document when the request to print is sent. Instead, the document acquiring device of Ikeda is polling to actually print the document. In contrast, Applicant's claimed polling request is sent to the spooling server to check for "any initiated print jobs" for the designated printer.

Applicants' claims 1 and 45 are amended to clarify that the polling and the initiating are separate communications to the spooling server. For example, with Applicants' claimed invention, the instruction to initiate printing can come from a variety of sources, and is separate from the polling request. For example, the instruction to initiate printing can be provided from the print job source itself, or from a separate interface to the spooling server (e.g., a web browser, a cellular telephone, a personal digital assistance, an Internet appliance, or the like).

Ikeda does not disclose or remotely suggest Applicants' claimed methods or apparatus. In particular, Ikeda does not disclose or remotely suggest receiving an instruction at the spooling server to initiate the print job for printing the document at a designated printer, initiating the print job for printing the document in response to the instruction, and separately sending a polling request for any initiated print jobs from a printer polling device associated with the designated printer to the spooling server, said polling request being automatically forwarded from the printer polling device to the spooling server, as claimed by Applicants.

Therefore, as the Examiner has acknowledged that Motegi and

Savitzky do not teach a polling request being automatically forwarded from a polling device to a spooling server, the combination of Motegi, Savitzky, and Ikeda would not have led one skilled in the art to Applicants' claimed invention.

In addition, like Motegi discussed above, one skilled in the art would not look to combine Savitzky and Ikeda as proposed by the Examiner.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art in view of the combination Motegi, Savitzky, and Ikeda, or any of the other references of record.


Withdrawal of the rejections under and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is therefore respectfully requested.

Further remarks regarding the asserted relationship between Applicants' claims and the prior art are not deemed necessary, in view of the amended claims and the above discussion. Applicants' silence as to any of the Examiner's comments is not indicative of an acquiescence to the stated grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider this application, allow each of the presently pending claims, and to pass this application on to an early issue. If there are any remaining issues that need to be addressed in order to place this application into condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas M. McAllister
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 37,886
Law Office of Barry R. Lipsitz
755 Main Street
Monroe, CT 06468
(203) 459-0200

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: MGI-177

Date: April 26, 2004